

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



**FILED**

09-10-07  
04:59 PM

Application of the North American Numbering  
Plan Administrator, on behalf of the California  
Telecommunications Industry, for Relief of the  
714 Numbering Plan Area

Application 07-03-010  
(Filed March 13, 2007)

**COMMENTS OF  
JOINT TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS  
ON PROPOSED DECISION**

Gregory L. Castle  
AT&T Services, Inc.  
525 Market St., Room 2022  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 778-1487  
Facsimile: (415) 974-1999  
Email: gregory.castle@att.com

Attorney for AT&T California and on behalf of  
the Joint Telecommunications Carriers

Date: September 10, 2007

## Subject Index

Page

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THEPROPOSED DECISION SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO PROVIDE FOR THIRTY DAYS BETWEEN THE BEGINNING OF MANDATORY DIALING AND THE FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF NUMBERS IN THE 657 AREA CODE. ....	3
III.	CONCLUSION.....	5

ATTACHMENT A: RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROPOSED  
DECISION’S ORDERING PARAGRAPHS

Pursuant to Rule 14.3 of the California Public Utilities Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Bell Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T California ("AT&T California"), Verizon Wireless, Sprint-Nextel Corporation, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT&T Mobility"), Omnipoint Communications Inc. d/b/a T-Mobile ("T-Mobile"), and Verizon California Inc. (collectively referred to as the "Joint Telecommunications Carriers") comment on the Proposed Decision of ALJ Bushey Granting Request for Area Code Overlay in the 714 Area Code ("Proposed Decision").

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Proposed Decision authorizes an area code overlay to add a new area code, 657, to the same geographic region as the 714 area code. The overlay will provide critical numbering resources to this geographic area and help ensure that consumers continue to have the ability to select the telecommunications service provider of their choice. Moreover, the overlay will minimize the impact of area code relief on consumers, mitigate the possibility of subjecting consumers (and carriers) to number exhaust in the 714 area code, and help maintain the viability of the competitive market. In addition, as the Proposed Decision recognizes, the overlay was the preferred option of the public and the consensus recommendation of the industry. Accordingly, the Joint Telecommunications Carriers fully endorse and commend the Proposed Decision's authorization of an overlay.

Indeed, as the Commission is aware, the Joint Telecommunications Carriers and the Commission Staff only recently concluded the implementation of the 310/424 overlay -- the first of its kind in California. By all accounts, the 310/424 overlay was extremely

successful.<sup>1</sup> First and foremost, new numbering resources were made available to consumers in the most expedient manner possible.<sup>2</sup> Second, the 310 PEP surpassed the 70% public awareness threshold anticipated by the Commission.<sup>3</sup> For example, the independent survey commissioned by the PEP found that 81% of residential customers were aware of the overlay as were 92% of telecom decisionmakers for business customers.<sup>4</sup> In fact, the 70% threshold was surpassed for all measured demographic groups: low income, seniors, Hispanic, African-American, and Asian.<sup>5</sup> Finally, the 310/424 overlay has allowed the carriers and the Commission staff to develop invaluable experience and materials which can – and should – now be used to facilitate the 714/657 overlay. The Proposed Decision, therefore, should be revised to acknowledge that, to the extent possible and consistent with the public education plan described in Exhibit E, the 714/657 Task Force and the Public Advisor’s Office should attempt to utilize the

---

<sup>1</sup> The success of the 310/424 overlay is attributable in particular to the diligent efforts (and cooperative work) of the PEP task force, which included service provider representatives and Commission staff representatives.

<sup>2</sup> As noted by the FCC, consumer choice is a fundamental concept underlying the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as well as this Commission’s delegated authority to implement area code relief:

Under no circumstances should consumers be precluded from receiving telecommunications services of their choice from providers of their choice *for a want of numbering resources*. For consumers to benefit from the competition envisioned by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, it is imperative that competitors in the telecommunications marketplace face as few barriers to entry as possible.

See *In the Matter of California Public Utilities Commission Petition for Delegation of Additional Authority Pertaining to Area Code Relief and NXX Code Conservation Measures* CC Dkt. No. 96-98, Order, 14 FCC Rcd. 17,486, FCC 99-248 (1999) (emphasis added).

<sup>3</sup> D.05-08-040, p. 57 (Ordering Paragraph 10).

<sup>4</sup> Harris Interactive, “310 Area Code Overlay Awareness Study,” Prepared for the Public Education Program Committee, p. 8 (July 2006).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

materials and processes developed in the 310/424 PEP, and to otherwise take advantage of the experience gained in implementing relief in the 310 area code.

In addition, the Joint Telecommunications Carriers respectfully suggest that the Proposed Decision be slightly modified as set forth below to avoid any unnecessary and unintended inconvenience for consumers.

## **II. THE PROPOSED DECISION SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO PROVIDE FOR THIRTY DAYS BETWEEN THE BEGINNING OF MANDATORY DIALING AND THE FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF NUMBERS IN THE 657 AREA CODE.**

The Proposed Decision allows carriers to begin assigning telephone numbers with the new 657 area code coincident with the start of mandatory 1+ 10 digit dialing.<sup>6</sup> However, as discussed below, the assignment of numbers at the start of mandatory-dialing could result in code conflicts and thus failed calls. The Joint Telecommunications Carriers, therefore, suggest that the Proposed Decision be revised to establish a thirty-day period between the start of the mandatory dialing period and the assignment of telephone numbers with the 657 area code.<sup>7</sup> This 30-day transition period is necessary to minimize the risk of failed calls to the new 657 area code.

In brief, telephone numbers in the new 657 area code technically cannot be used until seven-digit dialing capability is completely removed from the network and replaced with 1+10 digit dialing. Carriers, however, cannot replace seven-digit dialing with 1+10-digit dialing on a flash-cut basis. Rather, they must remove seven-digit capability and adequately test that removal has occurred in switches throughout their networks.

If sufficient time is not allowed to transition to 1+10-digit dialing before telephone numbers with the 657 area code are assigned, there is significant risk that calls

---

<sup>6</sup> Proposed Decision, p. 28, Ordering Paragraph No. 2.

<sup>7</sup> The 310/424 overlay was similarly modified to accommodate this same concern. See, e.g., Decision 05-08-040, p. 30.

will fail to complete. If a telephone number from the new 657 area code were activated while any seven-digit dialing capability remained in the network, a “code conflict” would arise in the switch translations while attempting to route the call. The new 657 area code telephone number would necessarily contain the duplicate of an already existing exchange (NXX) code (i.e., the first three digits of the seven-digit telephone number) and the network switching equipment would not be able to determine to which customer the call was being made, and the call would not complete.

To minimize the risk of such call failures, the Proposed Decision should be revised to establish a 30-day period between the start of mandatory 1+10-digit dialing and the assignment of telephone numbers from the new 657 area code. This same 30-day transition period was provided for in the 310/424 overlay and as a result, very few, if any, customers encountered these types of potential dialing problems.

To accommodate this 30-day period while maintaining the overall 12-month timeframe provided for in the Proposed Decision, the Joint Telecommunications Carriers suggest that the time allotted for network preparation be reduced from six (6) months to five (5) months. The carriers believe that their experience with the 310/424 will make that possible while preserving the same six-month permissive dialing period for consumers contemplated in the Proposed Decision. This modification is critical to providing consumers with a smooth transition to the new overlay and thus to the overall success of the area code relief plan set out by the Proposed Decision.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

The all-services overlay set forth in the Proposed Decision (as modified per these comments) is in the best interests of consumers in the 714 NPA, and the Joint Telecommunications Carriers look forward to working again with Commission Staff, consumers, and community groups so that the overlay is implemented effectively, efficiently, and, most importantly, with the least disruption and inconvenience for customers.

Dated: September 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/

Gregory L. Castle  
525 Market Street, 20th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Phone: (415) 778-1487  
Fax: (415) 974-1999  
E-mail: gregory.castle@att.com

Attorney for AT&T California and on behalf  
of the Joint Telecommunications Carriers

**RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO THE  
PROPOSED DECISION'S ORDERING PARAGRAPHS**

[Note: Additions are underlined and deletions are in strikeout text.]

**Modifications To The Proposed Decision's Ordering Paragraphs**

Ordering Paragraph 2 should be revised as follows:

A 12-month implementation interval is adopted, which will start on the effective date of this order, as set forth in Attachment C. The permissive dialing period shall begin ~~six~~ five months after the start of the 12-month implementation schedule and continue for six months, after which the mandatory dialing period shall begin. ~~Coincident with~~ No sooner than 30 days after the start of the mandatory dialing period, service providers may assign telephone numbers with the new 657 area code to new telephone lines and/or services.

Ordering Paragraph 7 should be revised as follows:

The Task Force shall implement, at a minimum, the public education program plan described in Attachment E. Attachment E set forth the criteria, requirements, objectives, and goals developed in D.96-12-086, D.98-05-021, D.98-12-081, D.99-02-074, and D.05-08-040 and the activities proposed by the telecommunications industry for the 714/657 area code overlay's public education program. To the extent possible, and to the extent they are consistent with the public education plan described in Exhibit E, the 714/657 Task Force and the Public Advisor's Office should attempt to utilize the materials and processes developed in the 310/424 PEP, and to otherwise take advantage of the experience gained in implementing relief in the 310 area code, to ensure that the overlay in the 714 area code is implemented as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Attachment C to the Proposed Decision should be modified as follows:

<b>714/657 Area Code Overlay Implementation Schedule</b>		
<b>MILESTONE</b>	<b>DURATION</b>	<b>START DATE</b>
Adoption of 714/657 Area Code Overlay Decision		
Public Education Program	12 months	Effective Date of the Order
Network Preparation Period	<del>6</del> <u>5</u> months	Effective Date of the Order



Permissive Dialing Period	6 months	<del>Six</del> <u>Five</u> Months from the Effective Date of the Order
First Customer Notice		Four Months from the Effective Date of the Order
Second Written Customer Notice		11 Months from the Effective Date of the Order
Mandatory Dialing Period <del>and Open New 657 Area Code (i.e., date by which telephone numbers with the 657 area code may be assigned to consumers)</del>		Six Months from the Start of Permissive Dialing Period
<u>Open New 657 Area Code (i.e., date by which telephone numbers with the 657 area code may be assigned to consumers)</u>		<u>At least 30 days from the Start of Mandatory Dialing Period</u>

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Thomas Selhorst, hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the  
**COMMENTS OF JOINT TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS ON**  
**PROPOSED DECISION** to all persons on the attached Service List in **A.07-03-010**, via  
e-mail and/or hand-delivery.

Dated this 10th day of September 2007 at San Francisco, California.

**AT&T CALIFORNIA**  
525 Market Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Thomas Selhorst  
On Behalf of Joint Telecommunications Carriers

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Updated on 25-JUN-2007 by: JVG  
A0703010 NOPOST

\*\*\*\*\* PARTIES \*\*\*\*\*

Gregory L. Castle  
Senior Attorney  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2022  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1487  
gregory.castle@att.com

Micki Burton  
Associate Directory - Regulatory  
AT&T CALIFORNIA  
525 MARKET STREET, 19TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1433  
michelle.burton@att.com

Jordan Goldstein  
Vice President, Federal Regulatory  
NEUSTAR, INC.  
2000 M STREET, N.W., SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON DC 20036  
(202) 533-2913  
Jordan.Goldstein@neustar.biz

Joseph R. Cocke  
Sr. Npa Relief Planner - Western Region  
NEUSTAR, INC.  
1445 E. LOS ANGELES AVE., SUITE 301-N  
SIMI VALLEY CA 93065-2817  
(805) 520-1945  
joe.cocke@neustar.com

\*\*\*\*\* STATE EMPLOYEE \*\*\*\*\*

Maribeth A. Bushey  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5018  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-3362  
mab@cpuc.ca.gov

Cherrie Conner  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2767  
chr@cpuc.ca.gov

Michael Evans  
Communications Division  
AREA 3-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2438  
mde@cpuc.ca.gov

\*\*\*\*\* INFORMATION ONLY \*\*\*\*\*

Leslie Edwards  
CITY OF HUNTINGTON  
2000 MAIN STREET, 3RD FLOOR  
HUNTINGTON BEACH CA 92648  
(714) 536-5697  
ledwards@surfcity-hb.org

Suzanne Toller  
Attorney At Law  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6500  
suzannetoller@dwt.com

Katie Nelson  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6500  
katiernelson@dwt.com

Gregory T. Diamond  
7901 LOWRY BLVD.  
DENVER CO 80230  
(720) 670-2018  
gdiamond@covad.com

Bill Kimbrell  
Chartered Financial Consultant  
SUITE 645  
8502 E. CHAPMAN AVENUE  
ORANGE CA 92869  
(714) 532-5100  
billkimbrell@socal.rr.com

Anita Taff-Rice  
Attorney At Law  
LAW OFFICES OF ANITA TAFF-RICE  
1547 PALOS VERDES MALL, NO. 298  
WALNUT CREEK CA 94597  
(415) 699-7885  
anitataffrice@earthlink.net